

K-12 Advisory Committee
February 20 and 21, 2006

Staff Summary

February 20, 2006

On Monday evening, February 20 three sub-committees met to gain information and discuss topics within their areas. The funding structures, education structures and equity and elimination the achievement gap subgroups met. For the first hour of the meeting the education structures group met with representatives of the higher education advisory committee to discuss transitions issues.

February 21, 2006

After opening and overview remarks, the three subgroups reported on their discussions of the prior evening:

Bette Hyde, Education Structures - This groups wants to add best practices of Washington State to the research that has been presented by the consultants to the advisory committee. They also want to address the inter-relationships of the components being considered and identify those that are missing. Additionally, it will be important to communicate with people to let them know where we are headed and hear what is important to them.

The conversation with members of the higher education advisory committee focusing on transitions discussed: Barriers such as ethnic, guidance, access for rural and remote individuals, capacity and data. Questions asked were: Should graduation requirements be the same as higher education entrance requirements? What is the structure to deliver recommendations?

OJ Cotes, Equity and Achievement Gap - They reviewed the common themes from the presenters in January, particularly the need for more involvement of families and needing all who have a relationship with schools to be heard. Ideas to be further discussed include: 1) Administrative training should have a component where individuals are placed in diverse school settings. 2) An inservice training program for teachers should be developed and piloted that would match teachers from schools with different backgrounds to spend time in the partner school and community. 3) Develop a more purposeful recruitment strategy and incorporate ideas such as teaching academies, identification of paraeducators and others on school staff. 4) Develop a mechanism to share good curriculum work that has been done. 5) Expand teaching strategies to include such skills as the use of oral story telling to engage students and connect subject matter with students.

Tim Washburn, Financial Structures - Tim lead this group as Jeff Vincent was out with the flu. They discussed conducting a review of the Wyoming funding study and work and possibly comparing their product to what we might want to produce, discussed the pros and cons of the current funding model and talked about products

from their work. With regard to this latter item, examples are: Which funding elements are prescriptive/mandated? If reduce class size, where do the classrooms and teacher come from – this would need to be addressed as a part of the plan.

The advisory committee then heard a report of the successful district study. The materials were discussed at length and suggestions made to clarify findings and conclusions.

The committee also discussed the consultants' plan for school visits. The next steps are to identify 40 schools/districts as follows: 20 schools in successful districts, 15 schools identified as "turn around" and 5 districts identified as "turn around." It was noted that schools from all three levels need to be included.

The consultants also completed explanation of the elements of the evidence-based model, picking up where they left off at the January meeting.

Following this discussion the advisory committee members again met in their subgroups to discuss evidence-based elements and to continue the work of their subgroups.